arXiv:math/0701054v1 [math.AP] 2 Jan 2007

# The Beale-Kato-Majda criterion to the 3D Magneto-hydrodynamics equations

Qionglei Chen [1], Changxing Miao [1], Zhifei Zhang [2]
[1]Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics,
P.O. Box 8009, Beijing 100088, P. R. China.
(chen_qionglei@iapcm.ac.cn and miao_changxing@iapcm.ac.cn)
[2] School of Mathematical Science, Peking University,
Beijing 100871, P. R. China.
(zfzhang@math.pku.edu.cn)

**Abstract.** We study the blow-up criterion of smooth solutions to the 3D MHD equations. By means of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, we prove a Beale-Kato-Majda type blow-up criterion of smooth solutions via the vorticity of velocity only, i. e. $\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_0^T\|\Delta_j(\nabla\times u)\|_\infty dt$, where $\Delta_j$ is a frequency localization on $|\xi|\approx 2^j$.

**Key words.** MHD equations, Blow-up criterion, Littlewood-Paley decomposition

**AMS subject classifications.** 76W05 35B65

## 1 Introduction

We consider the 3D incompressible magneto-hydrodynamics (MHD) equations

$$\text{(MHD)}\quad \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t}-\nu\Delta u+u\cdot\nabla u=-\nabla p-\dfrac{1}{2}\nabla b^2+b\cdot\nabla b,\\ \dfrac{\partial b}{\partial t}-\eta\Delta b+u\cdot\nabla b=b\cdot\nabla u,\\ \nabla\cdot u=\nabla\cdot b=0,\\ u(0,x)=u_0(x),\quad b(0,x)=b_0(x). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $u$, $b$ describe the flow velocity vector and the magnetic field vector respectively, $p$ is a scalar pressure, $\nu>0$ is the kinematic viscosity and $\eta>0$ is the magnetic diffusivity, while $u_0$ and $b_0$ are the given initial velocity and initial magnetic field respectively, with $\nabla\cdot u_0=\nabla\cdot b_0=0$. If $\nu=\eta=0$, (1.1) is called the ideal MHD equations.

Using the standard energy method, it can be easily proved that for given initial data $(u_0,b_0)\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $s>\frac{1}{2}$, there exists a positive time $T=T(\|(u_0,b_0)\|_{H^s})$ and a unique smooth solution $(u(t,x),b(t,x))$ on $[0,T)$ to the MHD equations satisfying

$$(u,b)\in C([0,T);H^s)\cap C^1((0,T);H^s)\cap C((0,T);H^{s+2}).$$

Whether smooth solutions of (1.1) on $[0,T)$ will lead to a singularity at $t=T$ is an outstanding open problem, see Sermange and Temam [17]. Caflisch, Klapper and Steele [2] extended the well-known result of Beale-Kato-Majda [1] for the incompressible Euler equations to the 3D ideal MHD equations, precisely, under the condition:

$$\int_0^T (\|\nabla\times u(t)\|_\infty + \|\nabla\times b(t)\|_\infty)dt < \infty, \tag{1.2}$$

then smooth solutions $(u,b)$ can be extended beyond $t = T$. Recently, there are some researches which have refined (1.2) such as

$$\int_0^T (\|\nabla\times u(t)\|_{\dot{B}^0_{\infty,\infty}} + \|\nabla\times b(t)\|_{\dot{B}^0_{\infty,\infty}})dt < \infty, \qquad \text{(see [24])}.$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_{T-\varepsilon}^T (\|\Delta_j(\nabla\times u)(t)\|_\infty + \|\Delta_j(\nabla\times b)(t)\|_\infty)dt = \delta < M, \qquad \text{(see [3])}$$

for some positive constant $M$, and $\Delta_j$ is a frequency localization on $|\xi| \approx 2^j$. These results can be easily extended to (1.1) with $\nu, \eta > 0$. Wu [22] also extended some Serrin type criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations to the MHD equations. Many relevant results can be found in [20, 21] and references therein.

However, some numerical experiments [7, 16] seem to indicate that the velocity field plays the more important role than the magnetic field in the regularity theory of solutions to the MHD equations. Recently, inspired by Constantin and Fefferman initial work [6] where the regularity condition of the direction of vorticity was used to describe the regularity criterion to the Navier-Stokes equations, He and Xin [8] extended it to the MHD equations, but did not impose any condition on the magnetic field $b$ which was consistent with the result of numerical experiments. Precisely, they showed that the solution remains smooth on $[0,T]$ if the vorticity of the velocity $w = \nabla\times u$ satisfies the following condition

$$\big|w(x+y,t) - w(x,t)\big| \le K|w(x+y,t)||y|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{if } |y| \le \rho \quad |w(x+y,t)| \ge \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

for $t \in [0,T]$ and three positive constants $K$, $\rho$, $\Omega$. Also, they [8] and Zhou [25] obtained some integrability condition of the magnitude of the only velocity $u$ alone, or the only gradient of the velocity $\nabla u$ alone to characterize the regularity criterion to the MHD equations, i.e.

$$\int_0^T \|u(t)\|_p^q dt < \infty, \quad \frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{p} \le 1 \quad 3 < p \le \infty; \tag{1.4}$$

or

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla u(t)\|_p^q dt < \infty, \quad \frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{p} \le 2 \quad \frac{3}{2} < p \le \infty. \tag{1.5}$$

We restrict ourselves to substitute $\nabla u$ by the vorticity $w$ in (1.5). In the case $p < \infty$, using the Biot-Savart law [12] and the bounds of the Riesz transforms [18] on $L^p(1 < p < \infty)$, the condition (1.5) can be replaced by

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla\times u(t)\|_p^q dt < \infty, \quad \frac{2}{q} + \frac{3}{p} \le 2, \quad \frac{3}{2} < p < \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

However, since the lack of continuity of Riesz transforms on $L^\infty$, their results missed the important marginal case $p = \infty$ which exactly corresponds to the Beale-Kato-Majda criterion. In the case of the Euler equations, Beale, Kato, and Majda get around this difficulty by using the logarithmic Sobolev inequality:

$$\|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq C(1 + \|\nabla \times u\|_\infty \log(e + \|u\|_{H^s})), \quad s > 5/2. \tag{1.7}$$

For a refined form of this inequality, it can be referred to [11, 14]. In order to make use of (1.7), one need to estimate the higher order derivatives of the solution (at least in $H^s, s > 5/2$). But, in the case of the MHD equations, it seems difficult to control them by the only $\|\nabla \times u\|_\infty$. Therefore, as in [2], if the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (1.7) is used, one can only derive a criterion described by the vorticity of $u$ and $b$ . This difficulty is avoided by the following two observations. On one hand, the $H^1$ norm of the solution can be used to control any $H^s$ norm of the solution, while the $H^1$ norm of the solution $(u, b)$ can be controlled by $\|\nabla u\|_\infty$. On the other hand, if we make use of Littlewood-Paley decomposition to decompose the nonlinear terms into three parts: low frequency, middle frequency and high frequency, and deal with each part by virtue of different estimates, we can refine $\|\nabla u\|_\infty$ to $\|\nabla \times u\|_\infty$. It should be pointed out that we do not apply the Littlewood-Paley decomposition to the equation itself as some researches do before, since if we localize the equation on a dyadic partition, we cannot control the $H^1$ norm of the solution $(u, b)$ via $\|\nabla \times u\|_{L^\infty}$ in the end when summing up every dyadic partition.

Finally, we remark that the blow-up criterion we will establish in the framework of mixed time-space Besov spaces may be the most relaxed in some sense as for the incompressible Euler equations [15] and the Idea MHD equations [3], where the losing estimate for the solution and the logarithmic Sobolev inequality are applied to set up the blow-up criterion, but in this paper, if we follow their method, as we mentioned above, we cannot characterize the blow-up of smooth solutions by $\nabla \times u$ only.

Now we state our result as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $(u_0, b_0) \in H^s$, $s > \frac{1}{2}$ with $\nabla \cdot u_0 = \nabla \cdot b_0 = 0$. Suppose that $(u, b) \in C([0, T); H^s) \cap C^1((0, T); H^s) \cap C((0, T); H^{s+2})$ is the smooth solution to (1.1). If there exists an absolute constant $M > 0$ such that if*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{T-\varepsilon}^{T} \|\Delta_j (\nabla \times u)\|_\infty dt = \delta < M, \tag{1.8}$$

*then $\delta = 0$, and the solution $(u, b)$ can be extended past time $t = T$. In other words, if*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{T-\varepsilon}^{T} \|\Delta_j (\nabla \times u)\|_\infty dt \geq M, \tag{1.9}$$

*then the solution blows up at $t = T$. Here $\Delta_j$ is a frequency localization on $|\xi| \approx 2^j$, see Section 2.*

**Remark 1.1.** *For the Navier-Stokes equations (with $b = 0$ in (1.1)), Kozono, Taniuchi [10], and Kozono, Ogawa, Taniuchi [11] refined the Beale-Kato-Majda criterion to*

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla \times u(t)\|_{BMO} dt < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^T \|\nabla \times u(t)\|_{\dot{B}^0_{\infty,\infty}} dt < \infty,$$

*respectively. Here* $\dot{B}^0_{\infty,\infty}$ *stands for the homogenous Besov spaces, see Section 2 for the definition. The condition (1.8) is weaker than all the above mentioned conditions. Hence, this also improves the results of [10, 11]. For the further explanation of (1.8), it can be referred to the remarks after Theorem 1 in [15].*

**Remark 1.2.** *Very recently, Wu [23] use the energy estimate combined with the Bony para-product technique to derive many interesting regularity criterions for the generalized MHD equations. In the marginal case, the regularity criterion obtained there can be expressed as*

$$\int_0^T \|u(t)\|^{1+\delta}_{B^1_{\infty,\infty}} dt < \infty, \quad or \quad \int_0^T \|u(t)\|_{B^{1+\epsilon}_{\infty,\infty}} dt < \infty,$$

*for some* $\delta, \epsilon > 0$. *Here* $B^s_{p,q}$ *stands for the inhomogenous Besov spaces, see Section 2 for the definition. But the velocity* $u$ *cannot be replaced by its vorticity, since the Riesz transformation is not bounded in* $B^s_{\infty,\infty}$.

**Remark 1.3.** *For the Ideal MHD equations, whether similar result holds is still open, since the viscous term plays an important role in our proof.*

**Notation:** Throughout the paper, $C$ stands for a "harmless" constant, and changes from line to line; $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the norm of the Lebesgue space $L^p$.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be the Schwartz class of rapidly decreasing functions. Given $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, its Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}f = \hat{f}$ is defined by

$$\hat{f}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-ix\cdot\xi} f(x) dx.$$

Now let us recall the Littlewood-Paley decomposition (see [4, 19]). Choose two nonnegative radial functions $\chi, \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, supported respectively in $\mathcal{B} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3, |\xi| \leq \frac{4}{3}\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3, \frac{3}{4} \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{8}{3}\}$ such that

$$\chi(\xi) + \sum_{j\geq 0} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$
$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3 \backslash \{0\}.$$

Let $h = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi$ and $\tilde{h} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\chi$, the frequency localization operator is defined by

$$\Delta_j f = \varphi(2^{-j}D)f = 2^{3j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} h(2^j y) f(x-y) dy,$$
$$S_j f = \chi(2^{-j}D)f = 2^{3j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{h}(2^j y) f(x-y) dy.$$

Informally, $\Delta_j$ is a frequency projection to the annulus $\{|\xi| \approx 2^j\}$, while $S_j$ is a frequency projection to the ball $\{|\xi| \lesssim 2^j\}$. Observe that $\Delta_j = S_j - S_{j-1}$. Also, if $f$ is an $L^2$ function then $S_jf \to 0$ in $L^2$ as $j \to -\infty$ and $S_jf \to f$ in $L^2$ as $j \to +\infty$(this is an easy consequence of Parseval's theorem). By telescoping the series, we thus have the homogeneous Littlewood-Paley decomposition

$$f = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{+\infty} \Delta_j f, \tag{2.1}$$

for all $f \in L^2$, where the summation is in the $L^2$ sense.

Let $s \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \le p, q \le \infty$, the homogenous Besov space $\dot{B}^s_{p,q}$ is defined by

$$\dot{B}^s_{p,q} = \{f \in \mathcal{Z}'(\mathbb{R}^3); \|f\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,q}} < \infty\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,q}} = \Big( \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{jsq} \|\Delta_j f\|_p^q \Big)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

(usual modification if $q = \infty$), and $\mathcal{Z}'(\mathbb{R}^3)$ can be identified by the quotient space of $\mathcal{S}'/\mathcal{P}$ with the polynomials space $\mathcal{P}$. The inhomogenous Besov space $B^s_{p,q}$ is defined by

$$B^s_{p,q} = \{f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3); \|f\|_{B^s_{p,q}} = \|S_0 f\|_p + \|\{2^{js}\|\Delta_j f\|_p\}_{j\ge 0}\|_{\ell^q} < \infty\}.$$

We now denote the operator $(I - \Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ by $\Lambda$ which is defined by

$$\widehat{\Lambda f}(\xi) = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{f}(\xi).$$

More generally, $\Lambda^s f$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ can be identified with the Fourier Transform

$$\widehat{\Lambda^s f}(\xi) = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \hat{f}(\xi).$$

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\|f\|_{H^s} \triangleq \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^2} \triangleq \Big( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1 + |\xi|^s)^2 |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and the Sobolev space $H^s$ is denoted by $H^s \triangleq \{f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3); \|f\|_{H^s} < \infty\}$. The usual Sobolev space $H^{s,p}$ is endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^{s,p}} \triangleq \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^p}.$$

We can refer to [19] for more details.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist constants $C$ independent of $f$, $j$ such that for all $1 \le p \le q \le \infty$*

$$\sup_{|\alpha|=k} \|\partial^\alpha \Delta_j f\|_q \le C 2^{jk + 3j(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} \|\Delta_j f\|_p, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\|R_k \Delta_j f\|_q \le C 2^{3j(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})} \|\Delta_j f\|_p. \tag{2.3}$$

*Here $R_k$ $(k = 1, 2, 3)$ is the Riesz transform in $\mathbb{R}^3$.*

The proof of this lemma can be found in [4, 13].

**Remark 2.1.** *Suppose that the vector function $f$ is divergence-free, and set $g = \nabla \times f$. Then there exist constants $C$ independent of $f$ such that*

$$\|\nabla f\|_p \leq C\|g\|_p, \quad \forall\ 1 < p < \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

*If the frequency of $f$ is restricted to some annulus $\{|\xi| \approx 2^j\}$, then there holds*

$$\|\nabla f\|_p \leq C\|g\|_p, \quad \forall\ 1 \leq p \leq \infty. \tag{2.5}$$

*Indeed, the inequality (2.4) can be derived from the Biot-Savart law [12] and the bounds of the Riesz transforms [18] on $L^p(1 < p < \infty)$, while the inequality (2.5) can be deduced from the Biot-Savart law and (2.3) .*

**Lemma 2.2** (Commutator estimate)**.** *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $s > 0$. Assume that $f, g \in H^{s,p}$, then there exist constants $C$ independent of $f$, $g$ such that*

$$\|\Lambda^s(fg) - f\Lambda^s g\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\nabla f\|_{L^{p_1}}\|g\|_{H^{s-1,p_2}} + \|f\|_{H^{s,p_3}}\|g\|_{L^{p_4}}) \tag{2.6}$$

*with $p_2, p_3 \in (1, +\infty)$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}.$$

This lemma is well-known and for a proof, see [9].

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We will divide the proof of Theorem 1.1 into two steps.

**Step 1.** $H^1$ estimates.

In this step we will show there exists $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{t\in[T-\varepsilon,T)} \big(\|u(t)\|_{H^1} + \|b(t)\|_{H^1}\big) \leq C\big(\|u(T-\varepsilon)\|_{H^1} + \|b(T-\varepsilon)\|_{H^1} + e\big). \tag{3.1}$$

Let $w(t, x) = \nabla \times u(t, x)$ and $J(t, x) = \nabla \times b(t, x)$. Taking the curl on both sides of (1.1), it can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial w}{\partial t} - \nu\Delta w + (u\cdot\nabla)w - (w\cdot\nabla)u - (b\cdot\nabla)J + (J\cdot\nabla)b = 0, \\ \dfrac{\partial J}{\partial t} - \eta\Delta J + (u\cdot\nabla)J - (J\cdot\nabla)u - (b\cdot\nabla)w + (w\cdot\nabla)b = 2T(b,u) \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

with

$$T(b,u) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 b\cdot\partial_3 u - \partial_3 b\cdot\partial_2 u \\ \partial_3 b\cdot\partial_1 u - \partial_1 b\cdot\partial_3 u \\ \partial_1 b\cdot\partial_2 u - \partial_2 b\cdot\partial_1 u \end{pmatrix}.$$

Multiplying the first equation of (3.2) by $w$, the second one of (3.2) by $J$, then adding the resulting equations yields that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(\|w(t)\|_2^2+\|J(t)\|_2^2)+\nu\|\nabla w(t)\|_2^2+\eta\|\nabla J(t)\|_2^2=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(w\cdot\nabla)u\cdot wdx+\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(J\cdot\nabla)u\cdot Jdx\\&\qquad-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big((J\cdot\nabla)b\cdot w+(w\cdot\nabla)b\cdot J\big)dx+2\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}T(b,u)\cdot Jdx\\&\triangleq I+II+III+2\,IV,\end{aligned}\tag{3.3}$$

where we have used the facts

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(u\cdot\nabla)w\cdot wdx=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(u\cdot\nabla)J\cdot Jdx=0$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big((b\cdot\nabla)J\cdot w+(b\cdot\nabla)w\cdot J\big)dx=0,$$

which can be deduced from the $\mathrm{div}u=\mathrm{div}b=0$ and integrating by part.

In what follows, we will deal with each term on the right hand side of (3.3) separately below. Let us begin with estimating the term $I$. Using the Littlewood-Paley decomposition (2.1), we have

$$w=\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\Delta_jw=\sum_{j<-N}\Delta_jw+\sum_{-N\le j\le N}\Delta_jw+\sum_{j>N}\Delta_jw,\tag{3.4}$$

where $N$ is a positive integer to be determined later. Putting (3.4) into $I$ produces that

$$\begin{aligned}I&=\sum_{j<-N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(w\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta_jwdx+\sum_{j=-N}^{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(w\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta_jwdx+\sum_{j>N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(w\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta_jwdx\\&\triangleq I_1+I_2+I_3.\end{aligned}$$

Using the Hölder inequality, (2.4) and (2.2) to obtain that

$$|I_1|\le\|w\|_2\|\nabla u\|_2\sum_{j<-N}\|\Delta_jw\|_\infty\le C\|w\|_2^2\sum_{j<-N}2^{\frac{3}{2}j}\|\Delta_jw\|_2\le C2^{-\frac{3}{2}N}\|w\|_2^3,\tag{3.5}$$

$$|I_2|\le\|w\|_2\|\nabla u\|_2\sum_{-N\le j\le N}\|\Delta_jw\|_\infty\le C\|w\|_2^2\sum_{-N\le j\le N}\|\Delta_jw\|_\infty.\tag{3.6}$$

From the Hölder inequality, (2.4), (2.2) and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|I_3|&\le\|w\|_3\|\nabla u\|_3\sum_{j>N}\|\Delta_jw\|_3\le C\|w\|_3^2\sum_{j>N}2^{\frac{j}{2}}\|\Delta_jw\|_2\\&\le C\|w\|_3^2\Big(\sum_{j>N}2^{-j}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\sum_{j>N}2^{2j}\|\Delta_jw\|_2^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\le C2^{-\frac{N}{2}}\|w\|_2\|\nabla w\|_2^2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

By summing up (3.5)-(3.7), we get

$$|I| \leq C\big(2^{-\frac{3}{2}N}\|w\|_2^3 + \|w\|_2^2 \sum_{-N\leq j\leq N} \|\Delta_j w\|_\infty + 2^{-\frac{N}{2}}\|w\|_2\|\nabla w\|_2^2\big). \tag{3.8}$$

Using the Littlewood-Paley decomposition (2.1) to $\nabla u$, $II$ can be written as

$$II = \sum_{j<-N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(J\cdot\nabla)\Delta_j u\cdot J dx + \sum_{j=-N}^{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(J\cdot\nabla)\Delta_j u\cdot J dx + \sum_{j>N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(J\cdot\nabla)\Delta_j u\cdot J dx.$$

Then the Hölder inequality, (2.2), (2.5) and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality allow us to show that

$$|II| \leq C\big(2^{-\frac{3}{2}N}\|w\|_2\|J\|_2^2 + \|J\|_2^2 \sum_{-N\leq j\leq N} \|\Delta_j w\|_\infty + 2^{-\frac{N}{2}}\|J\|_2\|\nabla w\|_2\|\nabla J\|_2\big). \tag{3.9}$$

Similarly, using the Littlewood-Paley decomposition (2.1), $III$ and $IV$ can be written respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} III = &\sum_{j<-N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} J\cdot\big(\nabla b + (\nabla b)^T\big)\cdot\Delta_j w dx + \sum_{j=-N}^{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} J\cdot\big(\nabla b + (\nabla b)^T\big)\cdot\Delta_j w dx \\ &+ \sum_{j>N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} J\cdot\big(\nabla b + (\nabla b)^T\big)\cdot\Delta_j w dx, \\ IV = &\sum_{j<-N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} T(b,\Delta_j u)\cdot J dx + \sum_{j=-N}^{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} T(b,\Delta_j u)\cdot J dx + \sum_{j>N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} T(b,\Delta_j u)\cdot J dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then exactly as in the derivation of (3.8), (3.9), we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |III| + 2|IV| \leq C\big(&2^{-\frac{3}{2}N}\|w\|_2\|J\|_2^2 + \|J\|_2^2 \sum_{-N\leq j\leq N}\|\Delta_j w\|_\infty \\ &+ 2^{-\frac{N}{2}}\|J\|_2\|\nabla w\|_2\|\nabla J\|_2\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Combining (3.8)-(3.10) with (3.3), Young inequality yields that for $t\in[0,T)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\big(\|w(t)\|_2^2 + \|J(t)\|_2^2\big) + 2\nu\|\nabla w(t)\|_2^2 + 2\eta\|\nabla J(t)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq C\bigg(2^{-\frac{3}{2}N}\big(\|w(t)\|_2^3 + \|J(t)\|_2^3\big) + \sum_{-N\leq j\leq N}\|\Delta_j w(t)\|_\infty\big(\|w(t)\|_2^2 + \|J(t)\|_2^2\big) \\ &\quad + 2^{-\frac{N}{2}}\big(\|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2\big)\big(\|\nabla w(t)\|_2^2 + \|\nabla J(t)\|_2^2\big)\bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now let us choose a fixed positive integer $N$ such that $C2^{-\frac{N}{2}}\big(\|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2\big) \leq \min(\nu,\eta)$, i.e.

$$N \geq \left[\frac{2}{\log 2}\log^+\left(\frac{C}{\min(\nu,\eta)}\big(\|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2\big)\right)\right] + 1. \tag{3.12}$$

where $\log^+ x = \log(e+x)$. Thus (3.11) and (3.12) imply that for $t \in [0,T)$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\big(\|w(t)\|_2^2 + \|J(t)\|_2^2\big) + \nu\|\nabla w(t)\|_2^2 + \eta\|\nabla J(t)\|_2^2\\ &\le C\sum_{j=-N}^{N}\|\Delta_j w(t)\|_\infty\big(\|w(t)\|_2^2 + \|J(t)\|_2^2\big) + C,\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

which together with the Gronwall inequality gives that for $t \in [0,T)$

$$\|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2 \le \exp\left(C\sum_{j=-N}^{N}\int_0^t \|\Delta_j w(t')\|_\infty dt'\right)(\sqrt{Ct} + \|w(0)\|_2 + \|J(0)\|_2).$$

Recalling the choice of $N$ in (3.12), it follows from the above estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}\|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2 \le \exp&\left(C\log^+\big(\|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2\big)\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_0^t \|\Delta_j w(t')\|_\infty dt'\right)\\ &\times(\sqrt{Ct} + \|w(0)\|_2 + \|J(0)\|_2).\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, let $E(t) \triangleq \|w(t)\|_2 + \|J(t)\|_2$, the above inequality implies that

$$\sup_{[0,T)} E(t) \le \exp\left(C\log^+\big(\sup_{[0,T)} E(t)\big)\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_0^T \|\Delta_j w(t')\|_\infty dt'\right)(\sqrt{CT} + E(0)). \tag{3.14}$$

We point out that the inequality (3.14) still holds if the time interval is replaced by $[T-\varepsilon, T)$. It follows from (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[T-\varepsilon,T)} E(t) \le \exp&\left(\log^+ \sup_{t\in[T-\varepsilon,T)} E(t)\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \|\Delta_j w(t')\|_\infty dt'\right)\\ &\times(\sqrt{C\varepsilon} + \|w(T-\varepsilon)\|_2 + \|J(T-\varepsilon)\|_2).\end{aligned}$$

Defining $Z(T) \triangleq \log\big(\sup_{t\in[T-\varepsilon,T)} E(t) + e\big)$, the above estimate means that

$$Z(T) \le \log\big(\sqrt{C\varepsilon} + E(T-\varepsilon) + e\big) + CZ(T)\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \|\Delta_j w(t')\|_\infty dt'. \tag{3.15}$$

If we choose $M = \frac{1}{2C}$ in Theorem 1.1, the condition (1.8) ensures that there exists a small positive $\varepsilon_0$ such that

$$C\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \|\Delta_j w(t')\|_\infty dt' \le \frac{1}{2}, \qquad \forall\, \varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0).$$

Then the inequality (3.15) implies that

$$Z(T) \le 2\log\big(E(T-\varepsilon) + e\big), \qquad \forall\, \varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0). \tag{3.16}$$

On the other hand, it is easy to prove that the solution $(u, b)$ satisfies the energy inequality

$$\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \|b(t)\|_2^2 + 2\int_s^t \big(\nu\|\nabla u(t')\|_2^2 + \eta\|\nabla b(t')\|_2^2\big)dt' \le \|u(s)\|_2^2 + \|b(s)\|_2^2,$$

which together with (3.16), (2.4) implies (3.1).

**Step 2.** $H^s(s > 1)$ estimates.

For completeness, we will show how to deduce $H^s$ estimates from $H^1$ estimates. Taking the operation $\Lambda^s$ on both sides of (1.1), multiplying $(\Lambda^s u, \Lambda^s b)$ to the resulting equation, and integrating over $\mathbb{R}^3$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_2^2 + \|\Lambda^s b(t)\|_2^2) + \nu\|\nabla\Lambda^s u(t)\|_2^2 + \eta\|\nabla\Lambda^s b(t)\|_2^2\\&= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Lambda^s(u\cdot\nabla u)\Lambda^s u dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Lambda^s(b\cdot\nabla b)\Lambda^s u dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Lambda^s(u\cdot\nabla b)\Lambda^s b dx\\&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\Lambda^s(b\cdot\nabla u)\Lambda^s b dx. \end{aligned}\tag{3.17}$$

Noting that $\mathrm{div}u = \mathrm{div}b = 0$ and integrating by parts, we rewrite (3.17) as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}(\|\Lambda^s u(t)\|_2^2 + \|\Lambda^s b(t)\|_2^2) + \nu\|\nabla\Lambda^s u(t)\|_2^2 + \eta\|\nabla\Lambda^s b(t)\|_2^2\\&= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\Lambda^s(u\cdot\nabla u) - u\cdot\Lambda^s\nabla u)\Lambda^s u dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\Lambda^s(u\cdot\nabla b) - u\cdot\Lambda^s\nabla b)\Lambda^s b dx\\&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(\Lambda^s(b\cdot\nabla b) - b\cdot\Lambda^s\nabla b)\Lambda^s u + (\Lambda^s(b\cdot\nabla u) - b\cdot\Lambda^s\nabla u)\Lambda^s b dx\\&\triangleq \Pi_1 + \Pi_2 + \Pi_3.\end{aligned}\tag{3.18}$$

For the term $\Pi_1$, it follows from (2.6), Hölder inequality, Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}|\Pi_1| &\le C(\|\nabla u\|_2\|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1,4}} + \|u\|_{H^{s,4}}\|\nabla u\|_2)\|u\|_{H^{s,4}}\\&\le C\|\nabla u\|_2\|u\|_{H^s}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nabla u\|_{H^s}^{\frac{3}{2}} \le C\|\nabla u\|_2^4\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^s}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

The other terms can be treated in the same way:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Pi_2| + |\Pi_3| \le\ & C(\|\nabla u\|_2\|\nabla b\|_{H^{s-1,4}} + \|u\|_{H^{s,4}}\|\nabla b\|_2)\|b\|_{H^{s,4}}\\&+ C(\|\nabla b\|_2\|\nabla b\|_{H^{s-1,4}} + \|b\|_{H^{s,4}}\|\nabla b\|_2)\|u\|_{H^{s,4}}\\&+ C(\|\nabla b\|_2\|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1,4}} + \|b\|_{H^{s,4}}\|\nabla u\|_2)\|b\|_{H^{s,4}}\\ \le\ & C(\|\nabla u\|_2^4 + \|\nabla b\|_2^4)(\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b\|_{H^s}^2) + \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{\eta}{2}\|\nabla b\|_{H^s}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

By summing up (3.19) and (3.20) with (3.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}(\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{H^s}^2) + \nu\|\nabla u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \eta\|\nabla b(t)\|_{H^s}^2\\&\quad\le C(\|\nabla u(t)\|_2^4 + \|\nabla b(t)\|_2^4)(\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|b(t)\|_{H^s}^2).\end{aligned}$$

Then the Gronwall inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u(t)\|^2_{H^s}+\|b(t)\|^2_{H^s}+\int_0^t(\nu\|\nabla u(t')\|^2_{H^s}+\eta\|\nabla b(t')\|^2_{H^s})dt'\\&\leq C(\|u(0)\|^2_{H^s}+\|b(0)\|^2_{H^s})\exp\left(t\sup_{t'\in[0,t)}\|(u(t'),b(t'))\|^4_{H^1}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.21}$$

Hence we have the $H^s$ regularity for the solution at $t=T$ and the solution can be continued after $t=T$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Acknowledgements** Q. Chen and C. Miao were partly supported by the NSF of China (10571016) and The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Z. Zhang is supported by the NSF of China(10601002). The authors wish to thank Prof.Zhouping Xin for stimulating discussion about this problem.

# References

[1] J. T. Beale, T. Kato and A. J. Majda, *Remarks on the breakdown of smooth solutions for the 3-D Euler equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., 94(1984), 61-66.

[2] R. E. Caflisch, I. Klapper and G. Steele, *Remarks on singularities, dimension and energy dissipation for ideal hydrodynamics and MHD*, Comm. Math. Phys., 184(1997), 443-455.

[3] M. Cannone, Q. Chen and C. Miao, *A losing estimate for the Ideal MHD equations with application to Blow-up criterion*, SIAM J. Math. Anal..

[4] J.-Y. Chemin, *Perfect Incompressible Fluids*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

[5] J.-Y. Chemin and N. Lerner, *Flot de champs de vecteurs non lipschitziens et equations de Navier-Stokes*, J. Diff. Equations, 121(1992), 314-328.

[6] P. Constantin and C. Fefferman, *Direction of vorticity and the problem of global regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 42(1993), 775-788.

[7] A. Hasegawa, *Self-organization processed in continuous media*, Adv. in Phys., 34(1985), 1-42.

[8] C. He and Z. Xin, *On the regularity of weak solutions to the magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Diff. Equations, 213(2005), 235-254.

[9] T. Kato and G. Ponce, *Commutator estimates and Euler and Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math., 41 (1988), 891-907.

[10] H. Kozono and Y. Taniuchi, *Bilinear estimates in $BMO$ and the Navier-Stokes equations*, Math. Z., 235(2000), 173-194.

[11] H. Kozono, T. Ogawa and Y. Taniuchi, *The critical Sobolev inequalities in Besov spaces and regularity criterion to some semi-linear evolution equations*, Math. Z., 242(2002), 251-278.

[12] A. J. Majda and A. L. Bertozzi, *Vorticity and Incompressible Flow*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[13] Y. Meyer, *Wavelets and operators*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[14] T. Ogawa, *Sharp Sobolev inequality of logarithmic type and the limiting regularity condition to the harmonic heat flow*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 34(2003), 1318-1330.

[15] F. Planchon, *An extension of the Beale-Kato-Majda criterion for the Euler equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., 232(2003), 319-326.

[16] H. Politano, A. Pouquet and P. L. Sulem, *Current and vorticity dynamics in three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamic turbulence*, Phys. Plasmas, 2(1995), 2931-2939.

[17] M. Sermange, R. Temam, *Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 36(1983), 635-664.

[18] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princenton University Press, Princenton, 1971.

[19] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces*, Monograph in mathematics, Vol.78, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, 1983.

[20] J. Wu, *Analytic results related to magneto-hydrodynamics turbulence*, Phys. D, 136(2000), 353-372.

[21] J. Wu, *Bounds and new approaches for the 3D MHD equations*, J. Nonlinear Sci., 12(2002), 395-413.

[22] J. Wu, *Regularity results for weak solutions of the 3D MHD equations*, Discrete. Contin. Dynam. Systems, 10(2004), 543-556.

[23] J. Wu, *Regularity criteria for the generalized MHD equations*, preprint.

[24] Z. Zhang and X. Liu, *On the blow-up criterion of smooth solutions to the 3D Ideal MHD equations*, Acta Math. Appl. Sinica, E, 20(2004), 695-700.

[25] Y. Zhou, *Remarks on regularities for the 3D MHD equations*, Discrete. Contin. Dynam. Systems, 12(2005), 881-886.